THE READY HAND

Creole Elites, Metropolitan Military Constraint, and the Opportunism of Independence

Thomas J. Bryan
with research assistance from Claude (Anthropic)

Part of the collection: Patterns of Power — Systematic Analysis of Elite Control Mechanisms Across Civilizations

© 2026 Thomas J. Bryan. Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International.

Abstract

The standard narrative of colonial independence movements emphasizes ideology: Enlightenment philosophy, nascent nationalism, the contagion of revolutionary example. This paper argues that the decisive variable was not intellectual but structural. Creole elites—locally born descendants of European colonizers—possessed the full administrative, legal, military, and economic skillset required to govern. They owned land, managed labor, adjudicated disputes, organized militias, and ran extractive economies. What they lacked was not capability but opportunity. The metropolitan military—the credible threat that imperial armies would cross the ocean to enforce subordination—was the singular constraint keeping Creole elites in their secondary position. When total war occupied or destroyed that metropolitan military, Creoles moved immediately. The timing was not ideological but tactical: Spanish American Creoles declared independence within months of Napoleon's invasion of Spain; Asian and African colonial elites demanded sovereignty within years of Europe's exhaustion in World War II. This pattern, replicated across three centuries and four continents, demonstrates that colonial independence was fundamentally an act of elite opportunism—skilled administrators seizing power the moment the constraint on their ambition disappeared.

I. Introduction: The Paradox of the Capable Subordinate

Every colonial empire faced the same structural paradox. Governing distant territories required competent local administrators, educated in the metropolitan tradition, fluent in the language of law and commerce, capable of managing complex extractive economies. Empires needed Creoles. But every Creole thus educated, thus empowered, thus made capable of governance, was also a potential rival—someone who could, under the right circumstances, do exactly what the metropolitan governor did, without the metropolitan governor. The empire's instrument of control was simultaneously its greatest vulnerability.

The Spanish Empire solved this problem through a system of deliberate exclusion. Creoles—people of Spanish descent born in the Americas—could own haciendas, operate mines, manage trade, educate their sons at universities in Mexico City and Lima, serve in local militias, hold minor judicial posts, and accumulate enormous wealth. What they could not do was hold the positions that mattered. The highest offices—viceroy, captain-general, audiencia judge, bishop, intendant—were reserved for *peninsulares*, Spaniards born on the Iberian Peninsula. This was not an oversight. It was policy. The Bourbon Reforms of the late eighteenth century made it explicit: by 1807, only twelve of ninety-nine audiencia judges across the entire Spanish Empire were Creoles. Nearly every intendant was a peninsular. The highest military commands were reserved for men born in Spain. The message was clear: you may be rich, you may be educated, you may be Spanish in blood and culture, but you are not one of us.

This arrangement produced a class of people unique in the history of power: elites who possessed the complete craft of rule but were denied the authority to exercise it at the highest levels. They were not peasants dreaming of liberation. They were not intellectuals theorizing about justice. They were trained administrators, landowners commanding thousands of laborers, military officers leading colonial militia, legal scholars fluent in Roman and canon law—people who already governed in practice but were subordinated in status to peninsulares who, as multiple contemporary sources noted, were often recently arrived from Spain and "far below the creole elite they governed in terms of education, wealth, and culture."

The question this paper asks is simple: what kept them subordinate? And the answer, equally simple, transforms our understanding of colonial independence movements. What kept Creole elites subordinate was not ideology, not habit, not loyalty, and not lack of capability. It was the metropolitan military—the credible threat that rebellion would bring Spanish armies across the Atlantic to crush resistance, execute leaders, confiscate properties, and restore order. This threat had been demonstrated repeatedly. The Túpac Amaru II rebellion of 1780–1783, which mobilized approximately 100,000 people across the Andean highlands, was destroyed by some 15,000–20,000 Spanish troops. The Comunero Revolt of 1781 in New Granada was crushed within months once reinforcements arrived from Cartagena. The lesson was clear to every Creole with ambitions: challenge Spain and Spain will send soldiers.

The moment Spain could not send soldiers, Creoles moved. Not after years of ideological preparation. Not after building revolutionary organizations. Not after waiting for the masses to develop consciousness. Within months of Napoleon's invasion of Spain—within weeks of confirmed reports that no reinforcements would be coming—Creole elites across Spanish America established governing juntas, deposed viceroys, and claimed sovereignty. The ready hand grasped the moment the restraint was removed.

II. The Craft of Creole Governance

Education and Administrative Training

Creole elites were not self-taught rebels improvising governance after seizing power. They were products of a sophisticated educational system designed, ironically, by the empire that subordinated them. The Jesuits—until their expulsion in 1767—provided education primarily to the sons of the Creole elite across Spanish America. Universities in Mexico City and Lima, founded in the mid-sixteenth century, trained Creole lawyers, theologians, and administrators in the same intellectual traditions that shaped their peninsular counterparts. Creole students studied Roman law, canon law, philosophy, rhetoric, and the administrative sciences. Many traveled to Spain for advanced education, absorbing metropolitan culture directly before returning to the colonies.

This education was not decorative. It was functional training in the craft of rule. Creole lawyers staffed the lower tiers of the colonial judicial system, arguing cases in the same legal frameworks used by audiencia judges. Creole clergy administered parishes, managed mission economies, and navigated the complex intersection of ecclesiastical and civil authority. Creole estate owners managed labor systems, maintained account books, adjudicated disputes among workers, and coordinated with colonial officials on taxation and trade. The skillset was comprehensive: legal reasoning, financial management, labor organization, diplomatic negotiation, military command of local militia, and the deployment of belief systems to legitimate authority.

The parallel to the Moses-Sertorius framework developed elsewhere in this series is direct. Moses, raised in the Egyptian court, acquired the craft knowledge of imperial administration before deploying it to organize a displaced people in a new territory. Sertorius, trained in the Roman *cursus honorum*, used that same craft to build an alternative Roman state in Hispania. Creole elites were the colonial equivalent: trained in the metropolitan tradition, possessing the full repertoire of governance skills, but denied the metropolitan's status and authority. Like Moses and Sertorius, they were displaced elites—not geographically, but structurally. They occupied the territory but not the apex of the hierarchy.

Economic Power Without Political Authority

The economic position of Creole elites underscores their readiness to govern. Creoles owned the haciendas that produced sugar, tobacco, cacao, and wheat. They operated the silver mines that funded the Spanish treasury. They controlled local trade networks and, through the consulados (merchant guilds), managed commercial activity. By the late eighteenth century, Creole families in Mexico, Peru, Venezuela, and the Río de la Plata had accumulated fortunes that rivaled or exceeded those of the peninsulares sent to govern them.

The Bourbon Reforms made this asymmetry between economic power and political authority more acute. Spain's intendancy system, introduced in the 1780s, replaced the older corregidor system with new administrators drawn almost exclusively from the peninsula. The explicit goal was to centralize control and extract more revenue from the

colonies. Creoles who had previously purchased audiencia positions under the Habsburg system found that avenue closed as the Bourbon Crown ended the sale of judicial offices and filled courts with peninsulares. Tax collection, formerly contracted to Creole elites through tax-farming, was reclaimed by the Crown. The colonial militia was expanded using American-born soldiers, but the highest military positions remained reserved for peninsulares.

The result was a class of people who owned the productive wealth of an empire but were governed by outsiders sent from Madrid. They managed economies larger than those of many European states but could not hold the offices that set the rules for those economies. They commanded militia units but answered to peninsular generals. They educated their sons in law and administration but watched recently arrived Spaniards—men of lesser wealth, lesser education, and lesser local knowledge—assume the positions of authority.

The Missing Variable: Military Power

What prevented Creole elites from simply taking power? They had the wealth, the education, the local knowledge, the social networks, and the administrative experience. The answer is the metropolitan military—specifically, the credible threat of its deployment.

Colonial rule rested ultimately not on consent, not on cultural hegemony, not on economic dependency, but on the violence monopoly held by the metropolitan state. Spain maintained approximately 20,000–30,000 regular troops in the Americas at any given time during the eighteenth century, supplemented by a navy capable of transporting reinforcements across the Atlantic. This force was sufficient to deter rebellion through demonstration effect: every Creole who contemplated independence knew what had happened to Túpac Amaru II. Captured in 1781, he was forced to watch the execution of his wife, sons, and followers before being drawn and quartered in the public square of Cusco. His body parts were displayed across the Andes as a warning. The Comunero leaders in New Granada were similarly executed after their revolt was suppressed.

The metropolitan military functioned as a constraint not through its constant presence but through its potential deployment. Most of the time, colonial order was maintained by local forces—militia, police, the social authority of church and administration. But when these proved insufficient, the metropole could escalate. Spanish reinforcements could arrive within months. British expeditionary forces could be dispatched to India or the Caribbean. French soldiers could be deployed to Indochina or North Africa. The calculation for any would-be rebel was straightforward: initial success was possible against local forces, but sustained independence required defeating metropolitan military power. And metropolitan military power, backed by industrial economies and global logistics, was overwhelming.

This is why Creole resentment, which was real and deep, did not translate into rebellion for three centuries. The capability was present. The motivation was present. The opportunity was absent—because opportunity required the metropolitan military to be unavailable.

III. The Moment of Opportunity: When the Constraint Disappears

Spanish America, 1808–1810

Napoleon invaded Spain in 1808. By the summer of that year, French forces had occupied Madrid, forced King Ferdinand VII's abdication, and installed Joseph Bonaparte on the Spanish throne. The Spanish government fragmented: a Supreme Central Junta claimed to govern in Ferdinand's name from Seville, then fled to Cádiz when French armies advanced. Regional juntas competed for authority. The regular army was shattered in early defeats. By 1810, the French controlled most of the peninsula, and the resistance government in Cádiz governed perhaps fifty square miles of Spanish territory.

The Creole response was immediate. Not years later. Not after ideological maturation. Immediately. Caracas formed a governing junta in April 1810. Buenos Aires followed in May 1810. Bogotá, Santiago, Quito, and other colonial capitals established juntas

throughout 1810. The timing was not coincidental. It was precisely calibrated to the disappearance of the metropolitan military constraint.

Consider the viceroy's position. Don Baltasar Hidalgo de Cisneros, Viceroy of the Río de la Plata, had requested military reinforcements from Spain to deal with Creole restlessness. The response was unambiguous: no troops were available. Every soldier Spain could muster was fighting the French in the Peninsula. Cisneros's garrison in Buenos Aires numbered approximately fifteen hundred regular troops, supplemented by local militia of uncertain loyalty. When news arrived that Seville had fallen to the French, the Creole elite moved within days. The cabildo abierto of May 25, 1810 deposed Cisneros and established a junta of Creole leaders. Cisneros, who understood colonial administration perfectly, knew that under normal circumstances—with Spain intact, with troops available for deployment—such an act would have been crushed within months. But circumstances were not normal. The constraint had disappeared.

The pattern was identical across Spanish America. The movements initially claimed loyalty to Ferdinand VII—a rhetorical cover that reduced the perceived risk while Creoles consolidated control. But the substance was the seizure of sovereignty by people who already possessed every skill needed to exercise it. They did not need to learn governance. They needed the absence of the force that prevented them from governing.

The Revealing Contrast: Hidalgo vs. Iturbide in Mexico

Mexican independence provides the sharpest illustration of the distinction between popular revolution and Creole opportunism. Miguel Hidalgo's revolt of 1810–1811 was a genuine popular uprising. The Grito de Dolores mobilized tens of thousands of indigenous people, mestizos, and poor Creoles demanding abolition of slavery, return of lands, and end to tribute. This movement terrified the Creole elite. It threatened not just Spanish authority but the entire social hierarchy from which Creoles benefited. The response was instructive: Creole landowners allied with peninsular officials to suppress it. Hidalgo was captured and executed in 1811. His successor Morelos was similarly destroyed by 1815. The Creole elite demonstrated that they would defend the existing order against popular revolution—even at the cost of cooperating with the peninsulares they resented.

Mexican independence ultimately succeeded in 1821 through an entirely different mechanism. Agustín de Iturbide—a royalist military officer who had personally fought against Hidalgo and Morelos—announced the Plan de Iguala, a conservative movement designed to preserve elite power against the liberal Spanish Constitution of 1820. The Creole elite and the church hierarchy feared that Spanish liberalism would threaten their privileges. Iturbide's independence was not revolution against the social order but revolution to preserve it. The Plan de Iguala guaranteed property rights, maintained the Catholic Church's position, and offered the Mexican crown to a European prince. This was independence as elite self-preservation, not liberation.

The contrast is definitive. Hidalgo's movement, which genuinely threatened elite power, was crushed by Creole-peninsular coordination. Iturbide's movement, which preserved elite power, succeeded because Creole consensus supported it and Spain lacked the military resources to resist. The variable was never ideology or popular consciousness. It was always the relationship between Creole capability, Creole interest, and metropolitan military constraint.

The Pattern Beyond Spain: British India, French Africa, Dutch Indonesia

The Creole pattern was not unique to Spanish America. Wherever European empires created educated local elites to staff colonial administration, the same dynamic emerged: capable subordinates constrained by metropolitan military power, moving the instant that constraint weakened.

In British India, the pattern was strikingly similar. The British educated a class of Indian administrators, lawyers, and professionals through English-language schools and universities. Jawaharlal Nehru was educated at Harrow and Cambridge. Mohandas Gandhi studied law at University College London. Muhammad Ali Jinnah qualified as a barrister at Lincoln's Inn. These men and thousands like them possessed the complete administrative skillset required to govern. The Indian Civil Service, though headed by British officials, was staffed increasingly by Indian professionals who understood governance from the inside. The Indian National Congress, founded in 1885,

represented this educated elite's demand for a share of power—not a rejection of the system but a claim on its management.

For sixty years, this demand was contained by the same mechanism that contained Creole ambition: the metropolitan military. When the Quit India movement erupted in 1942, British forces suppressed it efficiently—90,000 arrested, approximately 1,000 killed, order restored within months. The Indian Army of 200,000 pre-war soldiers, commanded by British officers, was the instrument of control. But World War II expanded that army to 2.5 million men, politicized Indian soldiers through combat service in Burma and North Africa, and bankrupted Britain. By 1946, the Royal Indian Navy mutinied. The Indian Army's loyalty became questionable. Britain, with £21 billion in debt and a war-exhausted population demanding demobilization, could not sustain the military commitment required to maintain control. Indian independence followed within two years—not because Indian nationalist capability suddenly increased, but because British military constraint suddenly disappeared.

In French West Africa, colonial education created what scholars have termed a "small elite of local African leaders educated in Western universities." These leaders—Kwame Nkrumah in Ghana (educated at Lincoln University and the University of Pennsylvania), Léopold Sédar Senghor in Senegal (educated at the Sorbonne), Nnamdi Azikiwe in Nigeria (educated at Lincoln University and the University of Pennsylvania)—possessed the administrative and intellectual tools to govern. Their demands for self-governance were contained so long as European military power could enforce colonial rule. When World War II exhausted France, Britain, and Belgium, these educated elites moved with the same precision Creoles had demonstrated a century earlier. The timing was calibrated to metropolitan weakness, not to the maturation of ideology.

Indonesia followed the identical pattern. Dutch colonial administration had created an educated Indonesian elite, and Japanese occupation during 1942–1945 further politicized and militarized Indonesian nationalists. When Japan surrendered, Sukarno declared independence within two days—before Dutch forces could return. The Netherlands, occupied and bankrupted by five years of German occupation, attempted reconquest with 150,000 troops but lacked resources for sustained operations.

Indonesian independence was recognized in 1949 not because Indonesian forces were militarily superior to the Dutch, but because the Netherlands was too exhausted to maintain the violence monopoly that colonial rule required.

IV. Not Ideology: The Evidence Against the Standard Narrative

The conventional explanation for colonial independence emphasizes intellectual history: Enlightenment philosophy spreading to colonial elites, who absorbed concepts of natural rights, popular sovereignty, and national self-determination, then applied these ideas to their own situations. This narrative is not false—Creole elites did read Locke, Montesquieu, and Rousseau; Indian nationalists did invoke parliamentary democracy; African leaders did articulate pan-Africanist philosophy. But the ideological narrative fails to explain the timing, the pattern, or the outcomes of independence movements.

The Timing Problem

If ideology drove independence, we would expect movements to succeed when ideas matured, organizations developed, and popular consciousness reached critical mass. Instead, movements succeeded when metropolitan military power was disabled by total war—regardless of the state of ideological development. Enlightenment ideas circulated in Spanish America throughout the late eighteenth century, yet no successful independence movement emerged until Napoleon invaded Spain. Nationalist ideas circulated in India from the 1880s onward, yet independence was achieved only after World War II exhausted Britain. Pan-African thought developed in the 1900s–1930s, yet African decolonization occurred only after 1945.

The reverse is equally telling. When metropolitan power was intact, the most sophisticated ideological movements failed. The 1848 revolutions across Europe had Enlightenment philosophy, liberal constitutions, mass organization, and brilliant intellectual leadership. Every revolution was crushed because European military power was intact and elites coordinated suppression. Ideas without opportunity produce nothing.

The Behavioral Evidence

If ideology drove Creole independence, we would expect post-independence societies to reflect Enlightenment principles: land redistribution, democratic governance, abolition of caste hierarchies, expansion of citizenship. Instead, Creole-led independence movements systematically preserved the social order they inherited. Simón Bolívar, who quoted Rousseau and Montesquieu, maintained his personal estates and enslaved laborers. The Argentine May Revolution transferred power from peninsulares to Creole merchants and lawyers without altering land distribution. Chilean independence preserved the inquilino system of semi-feudal labor. Mexican independence under Iturbide explicitly guaranteed property rights and church privileges. Brazilian independence maintained slavery until 1888.

The pattern was consistent: Creole elites replaced peninsulares at the top of existing hierarchies without transforming those hierarchies. Indigenous populations remained subordinate. Enslaved people often remained enslaved. Land concentration persisted or intensified. The rhetoric was republican; the reality was oligarchic. This is precisely what we would expect if independence was motivated by elite self-interest rather than ideological commitment—Creoles wanted the positions and authority denied to them, not a new social order.

The Suppression of Genuine Ideology

Perhaps the strongest evidence against the ideological narrative is Creole behavior toward movements that were genuinely ideological. When Hidalgo and Morelos mobilized popular movements in Mexico demanding land redistribution and racial equality—movements driven by Enlightenment ideology applied consistently rather than selectively—Creole elites helped suppress them. When popular movements in the Andes invoked Túpac Amaru's legacy of indigenous liberation, Creoles distanced themselves. When enslaved Africans in Haiti achieved genuine revolutionary transformation, Creole elites across the Americas recoiled in horror at what they called "the Haitian example"—not because they opposed liberty in principle, but because they recognized that consistent application of liberty would threaten their own position.

Creole independence was ideologically selective: it invoked natural rights to justify separation from Spain but did not apply those rights to indigenous populations, enslaved Africans, or landless mestizos. This selectivity is inexplicable if ideology was the driver. It is perfectly explicable if self-interest was the driver and ideology was the instrument—a legitimating narrative deployed by elites who already wanted power and selected from available intellectual traditions the arguments that served their purpose.

V. The Universal Pattern: Constraint, Capability, Opportunity

The Creole pattern—capable subordinates constrained by metropolitan military power, moving when that constraint disappears—is not limited to colonial contexts. It describes a universal dynamic of elite power relationships.

In feudal systems, vassal lords possessed the military and administrative capability to rule independently but were constrained by the king's capacity to mobilize superior force through feudal levy. When royal power weakened—through succession crisis, foreign invasion, or civil war—vassals asserted independence. The fragmentation of Carolingian empire after the death of Louis the Pious (840 CE) saw counts and dukes transform delegated authority into sovereign power precisely when the central military constraint weakened. The pattern is identical to Creole independence: the capability existed, the motivation existed, and the opportunity arrived with the disappearance of the constraining force.

In modern corporate structures, regional managers or divisional heads possess operational capability to function independently but are constrained by headquarters' control of capital, legal authority, and the threat of termination. When parent companies weaken—through bankruptcy, acquisition turmoil, or strategic crisis—management buyouts, spin-offs, and breakaway firms emerge. The dynamic is structurally identical: capable subordinates moving when the constraint on their independence weakens.

The universality of the pattern suggests it reflects a fundamental structural dynamic rather than a context-specific historical phenomenon. Wherever a hierarchy creates

capable subordinates and maintains their subordination through force rather than consent, the relationship is inherently unstable. The subordinates will move at the first opportunity because they possess everything needed for independence except the absence of constraint. The hand is always ready. It waits only for the restraint to weaken.

VI. Implications: The Chaos Thesis and the Ready Hand

This analysis integrates with the Chaos Thesis developed in our broader study of revolutionary causation. The Chaos Thesis argues that revolutionary success requires elite chaos—typically created by total war—that disables the violence monopoly and prevents elite coordination. The Creole analysis adds a critical refinement: the revolution that exploits elite chaos is not a spontaneous popular uprising but typically an organized seizure by capable subordinate elites who have been waiting for exactly this opportunity.

The Chaos Thesis identifies total war as the variable that creates revolutionary opportunity. The Creole analysis identifies who seizes that opportunity and why. It is not the masses, though masses provide military manpower and political legitimacy. It is not intellectuals, though intellectuals provide ideological justification. It is the class of people who already possess the craft of rule—the administrative, military, legal, and economic skills required to govern—but have been denied the authority to exercise them by metropolitan military constraint. When the constraint disappears, they move with a speed and precision that reflects not spontaneous revolutionary fervor but long-frustrated competence finally unleashed.

This explains a pattern visible across all major decolonization periods. Post-independence governments are overwhelmingly led by the colonial-educated elite—the very class that most closely resembles the colonial administrators they replace. In Spanish America, Creole landowners and lawyers governed the new republics. In India, Congress Party leaders educated at British universities governed independent India. In Africa, graduates of European universities governed newly independent states. These were not accidental outcomes. They reflected the structural

reality that colonial education systems had created a class of capable administrators who needed only the removal of the metropolitan military constraint to assume power.

The implications are uncomfortable. Independence movements are typically narrated as popular liberation—oppressed peoples throwing off the yoke of colonial rule through consciousness, organization, and heroic struggle. This narrative is not false: popular participation was real, suffering under colonialism was real, and the courage of those who fought for independence was genuine. But the structural reality is that independence typically transferred power from metropolitan elites to colonial-educated local elites while preserving the hierarchies that subordinated everyone else. The ready hand that grasped power was a hand already trained to hold it—not the hand of the laborer, the peasant, or the enslaved, but the hand of the administrator, the landowner, and the officer. Independence was not the abolition of elite rule but its localization.

VII. Conclusion: The Hand Precedes the Moment

The standard history of colonial independence is a story of ideas: liberty transmitted through books, discussed in salons, proclaimed in declarations. This paper has argued for a different story—a story of capability, constraint, and opportunity. Creole elites possessed the complete craft of rule. Metropolitan military power constrained them. Total war removed the constraint. They moved.

The evidence is consistent across three centuries and multiple colonial contexts. Spanish American Creoles moved within months of Spain's paralysis. Indian elites achieved independence within two years of Britain's post-WWII exhaustion. African and Asian leaders claimed sovereignty as soon as European military power could no longer be projected. In every case, the timing correlated not with ideological development but with metropolitan military incapacity. In every case, the leaders who assumed power were members of the colonial-educated elite who already possessed the skills of governance. In every case, post-independence societies preserved the fundamental social hierarchies that had existed under colonial rule, with local elites replacing metropolitan elites at the apex.

This is not a cynical reading of history. The genuine suffering of colonized peoples, the real courage of independence fighters, and the meaningful achievement of sovereignty are not diminished by recognizing the structural dynamics that made independence possible at specific historical moments. But accurate understanding requires acknowledging that the decisive variable was not the strength of ideas or the depth of popular commitment. The decisive variable was the presence or absence of the metropolitan military constraint. When it was present, the most passionate movements were crushed. When it was absent, capable elites seized power with a speed that reveals long preparation rather than sudden inspiration.

The hand was always ready. It needed only the moment.

Bibliography

Adelman, Jeremy. Sovereignty and Revolution in the Iberian Atlantic. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006.

Anna, Timothy E. Spain and the Loss of America. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983.

Bell, David A. The First Total War: Napoleon's Europe and the Birth of Warfare as We Know It. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2007.

Brown, Judith M. Modern India: The Origins of an Asian Democracy. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Burkholder, Mark A. "From Creole to Peninsular: The Transformation of the Audiencia of Lima." Hispanic American Historical Review 52, no. 3 (1972): 395–415.

Burkholder, Mark A., and D. S. Chandler. From Impotence to Authority: The Spanish Crown and the American Audiencias, 1687–1808. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1977.

Bushnell, David, and Neill Macaulay. The Emergence of Latin America in the Nineteenth Century. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Clayton, Anthony. The Wars of French Decolonization. London: Longman, 1994.

Cooper, Frederick. Africa Since 1940: The Past of the Present. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Darwin, John. The Empire Project: The Rise and Fall of the British World-System, 1830–1970. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Esdaile, Charles. The Wars of Napoleon. London: Longman, 1995.

Gates, David. The Spanish Ulcer: A History of the Peninsular War. New York: Da Capo Press, 2001.

Holland, R. F. European Decolonization, 1918–1981: An Introductory Survey. London: Macmillan, 1985.

Kinsbruner, Jay. Independence in Spanish America: Civil Wars, Revolutions, and Underdevelopment. 2nd ed. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000.

Kuethe, Allan J., and Kenneth J. Andrien. The Spanish Atlantic World in the Eighteenth Century: War and the Bourbon Reforms, 1713–1796. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Lynch, John. The Spanish American Revolutions, 1808–1826. 2nd ed. New York: W. W. Norton, 1986.

Mamdani, Mahmood. Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

Mansergh, Nicholas. The Transfer of Power, 1942–1947. 12 vols. London: HMSO, 1970–1983.

Moore, Barrington Jr. Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy. Boston: Beacon Press, 1966.

Ricart-Huguet, Joan. "Colonial Education, Political Elites, and Regional Political Inequality in Africa." Comparative Political Studies 54, no. 14 (2021): 2546–2580.

Rodriguez, Jaime E. The Independence of Spanish America. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Sarkar, Sumit. Modern India, 1885–1947. London: Macmillan, 1989.

Shipway, Martin. Decolonization and Its Impact: A Comparative Approach to the End of the Colonial Empires. Oxford: Blackwell, 2008.

Skocpol, Theda. States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia, and China. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Tilly, Charles. Coercion, Capital, and European States, AD 990–1992. Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.

Villella, Peter B. Indigenous Elites and Creole Identity in Colonial Mexico, 1500–1800. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.